

REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested in view of the amendments and arguments presented herein.

New Claims 27-29 are added. Claims 1-29 are pending. Claims 1 and 13 are amended. No new matter has been added by the amendments. Support for the amendments can be found at least on pages 16-20 of the application.

§ 103 Rejections

According to the Office Action, Claims 1-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 4,937,743 (“Rassman”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,208,765 (“Turnbull”). Applicants respectfully traverse.

Applicants respectfully submit that neither Rassman nor Turnbull nor the combination thereof teaches or suggests “indicia coding a component in the plurality of components to indicate a redundancy in the plurality of components, the redundancy indicating more than one vendor is providing said component” as recited in independent Claim 1, “a code segment that modifies the pictorial representation of the existing system to include indicia coding that associates the plurality of components with vendors that provide products and services associated with the plurality of components to provide a visual display of the products and services offered by each of the vendors, wherein the indicia coding is operable for indicating a redundancy in the plurality of components ..., the redundancy indicating a component provided by more than one of the vendors” as recited in independent Claim 7 (emphasis added), “logic for indicia coding a component in the plurality of components to indicate a redundancy in the plurality of components, the redundancy indicating said component is provided by more than one vendor” as recited in independent Claim 13, and/or “displaying indicia coding that associates

components with vendors that provide products and services associated with the components to provide a visual display of the products and services offered by each of the vendors, wherein the indicia coding is operable for indicating a redundancy the redundancy indicating a component provided by more than one of the vendors” as recited in independent Claim 20 (emphasis added).

Applicants respectfully agree with the statement on page 9 of the Office Action, to the effect that Rassman does not disclose the features referred to above. Turnbull is relied upon as teaching those features. However, Applicants respectfully submit that Turnbull does not teach that which it is relied upon as teaching.

Specifically, column 3, lines 6-16, of Turnbull is relied upon as teaching “indicia coding a component in the plurality of components to indicate a redundancy in the plurality of components, the redundancy indicating more than one vendor is providing said component” as recited in Claim 1 and as similarly recited in the other independent claims. As noted in the Office Action, the cited portion of Turnbull states: “In the drawings, similar features in each part of the product control matrix have a common base reference numeral. To distinguish between similar features in different stages, the base reference numeral is followed by a dash and the number of the stage containing the feature. To further distinguish between similar features within a stage, the stage number is followed by a dash and the similar features are sequentially numbered. When a description refers to any one of the similar features, only the base reference numeral is used as a shorthand notation.”

However, even if, for the sake of argument, “similar” is read as “redundant” and “numeral” is read as “indicia coding,” then Turnbull (even in combination with Rassman) still does not teach or suggest the features recited in the claims. If, for the sake of

argument, “similar” is read as “redundant” and “numeral” is read as “indicia coding,” then Turnbull at best teaches indicia coding of redundant components, but does not teach (even in combination with Rassman) indicia coding of a component provided by more than one vendor. According to the claims, it is not the component that is redundant; it is the act of providing that component that is redundant. According to the claims, redundant acts of providing a component are indicated by indicia coding, not redundant instances of a component. Thus, Turnbull (even in combination with Rassman) does not teach or suggest “indicia coding a component ... indicating more than one vendor is providing said component” as recited in independent Claim 1 and as similarly recited in the other independent claims.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that independent Claims 1, 7, 13, and 20 are in condition for allowance.

Furthermore, Applicants respectfully submit that Rassman and Turnbull do not show or suggest the features of Claims 2-6, 8-12, 14-19, and 21-26 in combination with the features of their respective base claim, and that Claims 2-6, 8-12, 14-19, and 21-26 are in condition for allowance at least because they depend from an allowable claim.

In conclusion, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 1-26 traverse the basis for rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Conclusions

Applicants respectfully assert that all claims are in condition for allowance and earnestly solicit such action from the Examiner. The Examiner is invited to contact Applicants’ undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present application.

Please charge any additional fees or apply any credits to our PTO deposit account number: 50-4160.

Respectfully submitted,
MURABITO HAO & BARNES

Dated: July 7, 2011

/William A. Zarbis/

William A. Zarbis
Registration No. 46,120
Address: Two North Market Street, Third Floor
San Jose, CA 95113
Phone: (408) 938-9080 Ext. 113